## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,713	03/31/2006	Valery Bacv	175.8243USU	5783
27623 7590 05/23/2007 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			HELLNER, MARK	
STAMFORD,	CT 06901		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3663	•
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	05/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/542,713	BAEV ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mark Hellner	3663			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES and the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Ma	arch 2007.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.				
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-45</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-45</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	= : :				
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	r (PTO-413)			
2)  Notic 3) Inforr	the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 3663

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al (6,570,892).

Lin et al disclose a fiber laser comprising : a fiber (130) for generating laser light having an entrance and exit side; a pumped light source (150) for generating pumped light adapted to be coupled into the fiber through an entrance side; a resonator unit (110) on one of the exit or entrance sides of the fiber for feeding back light of a given wavelength range into the fiber; a dielectric layer (air gap between the collimator 114 and the reflector 113) of variable thickness; and means (640) for displacing the reflector such that the thickness of the air gap varies.

The structure recited above reads on claim 1.

Claims 3 and 5-22 recite inherent properties of elements 130, 150, 110,114, 113 and 640.

Claims 23 – 27 read on the operation of the structure applied to claims 1, 3 and 5-27.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 28-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al in view of Fernald et al.

The difference between Lin et al and the subject matter of claims 4 and 28-45 is the use a pressure variable gaseous medium to move the reflector 113.

It is first noted that the disclosure of Lin et al provides motivation to seek out known means for displacing a reflector via the teaching of element 640.

Figures 15 and 16 of Feranald et al teach that it was well known at the time of the present application to have used a pressurized gas to motivate optical control elements.

As a result, the use of a pressurized gas to motivate the reflector of Lin et al would have been obvious.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-45 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

**Primary Examiner** 

